

ENVELOPE SERIES

(QUARTERLY)

VOL. XI

JANUARY, 1909

No. 4

The Apportionment Plan at Work

The Pastors and the Appor- tionment Plan

Rev. Dan Freeman Bradley, D. D.

Overcoming Difficulties

Rev. William W. McLane, D. D.

From the Standpoint of the State Committee

Rev. William S. Beard

Testimonials

American Board of Commissioners
for Foreign Missions, Boston, Mass.

Annual Subscription, Ten Cents

Entered at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., as Second Class Matter

Foreword

The adoption of the Apportionment Plan of Benevolence was no sudden move on the part of the Congregationalists. The plan is the result of study and investigation on the part of denominational leaders running through a number of years. Under the strong impression that the churches were not adequately supporting the benevolences of the denomination, the National Council at its meeting in Portland, Maine, in 1898, appointed a committee to investigate the subject and recommend what measures should be taken. This committee was continued at later councils and finally recommended the appointment on the part of the benevolent societies of an Advisory Committee. This Advisory Committee after most careful investigation and conference with the societies, proposed the Apportionment Plan.

In reaching this conclusion, the Advisory Committee were influenced by the success of apportionment schemes in several of the States, in behalf of State Home Missionary Funds. It was also known that the State Association of Missouri, several years back, had placed all their benevolences on the apportionment basis. A still larger factor was the success of this method in other denominations, notably the Episcopal where the apportionment idea has led to a very large increase of gifts through a series of years. Nearly all the larger denominations either have come upon this basis or are taking steps in this direction.

The plan among Congregationalists looks to the raising of two million dollars per year, which sum is apportioned to the various interests, as follows.

American Board,	\$560,000
Congregational Home Missionary Soc'y,	470,000
American Missionary Association,	250,000
Congregational Church Building Society,	170,000
Congregational Educational Soc'y,	110,000
Congregational Sunday School & Pub. Soc'y,	100,000
Ministerial Relief,	40,000
Woman's Boards for Foreign Missions,	300,000

Omitting the \$300,000 for the three women's boards, in view of the fact that these boards have their own system of apportionment of many years' standing, the balance, or \$1,700,000, has been divided up among the various States by the Advisory Committee on the basis of the average contributions to these States during the past three years. The States, in turn, it is proposed, shall allot their amount to the several local conferences or associations, and these in turn allot to the churches. The leading States have heartily adopted this plan and are making an earnest endeavor to carry it to a successful issue. This number of the "Envelope Series" is devoted to the Apportionment Plan, in the hope that it may aid committee men and pastors in their work in behalf of all the benevolent interests of the denomination. Extra copies of this number can be secured free of cost, aside from postage, by writing to John G. Hosmer, Purchasing and Publishing Agent, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Readers of this number of our little quarterly who are not already subscribers may be interested to receive this publication statedly. If so, they should send to Mr. Hosmer the subscription price of ten cents.

CORNELIUS H. PATTON,
Home Secretary.

THE PASTORS AND THE APPORTIONMENT PLAN

BY REV. DAN FREEMAN BRADLEY, D. D.,
CLEVELAND, OHIO

There are two things to be said about the Apportionment Plan of Benevolences for our Congregational Churches. The first is that if it is good for anything it ought to be *worked*. And the second is that if the Apportionment Plan is to be worked, it must be *worked* by the pastor.

Now first, is the plan good for anything? Everybody agrees that it is. It is what we have all been crying for. Instead of haphazard appeals from all the societies and everybody else—disturbing, unsatisfactory to all concerned, making us ashamed to look our secretaries and returned missionaries in the face, causing the column of “other” benevolences in the Year-Book to swell out of all proportion to the things we claim to stand for, and for which we are responsible as a man is responsible for the babies he begets,—instead of all that confusion, we have asked for some agreement among the societies and some modern businesslike apportionment which we could take to our churches and say, “Now, brethren, here is our plan carefully worked out by the societies and the National Council’s Committee, and the State Associations’ Committee, and the Local District Committee. Here it is all clear and definite. That is what we have been demanding. That’s what we have got.”

It is no longer possible for us pastors to wash our hands of the business by criticising the societies as being out of harmony and control of the churches. Here is their answer to our demand that they heed the wishes of the churches. They have done their part. And the thing desired is here. It must be a good thing. If it is a good thing it ought to be worked right now.

When the societies agree together to this apportionment they thereby cut themselves off from some of the old methods of solicitation by which they gathered their funds. They exercise a certain self-control and reciprocity which the old "everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost" way did not recognize. They agree to canvass the churches as a whole, and submit to the regulation of such canvass as will secure the greatest co-operation. By so doing they surrender certain advantages of appeal. They forego the privilege of making *special* appeals, in a manner. The societies whose ability to appeal most deeply to the sympathy and the imagination of good people, sacrifice the most in this regard. By agreeing to this apportioned and regulated appeal they therefore are in danger of losing ground unless the apportionment is vigorously taken up and worked.

No scheme however fine theoretically will work itself. We *Congregationalists* are excellent people to propose fine drawn theoretical schemes, but when it comes to working them we are apt to be deficient. We believe in democracy—but democracy is dangerous unless every unit in the democracy gets out and does his duty. We are too apt to prize the name democracy without meeting its requirements. In our democracy we have demanded that the churches be regarded, and the appeals for all our causes be apportioned—but that does not of itself secure the actual dollars. No apportionment ever did. It is therefore necessary for us to get at this thing and actually *work* it, and do it before the beginning of another calendar year in our churches. Before the schedules of benevolence are made out in December or in January, our standing committees in the local churches should have in their hands in black and white, a list of the causes to which they are expected to give and the exact amounts agreed upon for each cause; and they should be vigorously urged to adjust their work and their giving to that minimum.

If that is not the thing for every church to do then our cry for co-operation of the societies and their adjustment to the wishes of the

churches is a word of empty meaning — just an academic subject to discuss in our representative assemblies. On the other hand, if there has been a particle of sincerity and sense in our ten year old agitation for better methods, then this is the year for us to get at it and try to work it out locally. Of course we may hear the old cry of the independence of the local church, and that it is nobody's business to instruct a local church, much less the pastor of such a church, as to what he ought to do. Probably that old scarecrow will be dragged out to do duty once more. Nevertheless the scheme must be worked, and worked now, or we shall lapse into the old irresponsible way of doing our business and add one more reproach to our free self-governing co-operating polity.

And the second point is that if the thing is to be worked it must be worked by the pastors. The Congregational pastor in these days is called upon to justify his existence. Men are asking if he is economically productive. He is no longer regarded as a fountain of information. His information is not always accurate as to current events or even as to history and science. The magazines and critical histories are apt to be more reliable than his sermons. He is not always to be followed in sociological and political questions. He is generally right, but he sometimes apologizes for rascals and very often mistakes the temporary for the permanent interests of men. He too often forgets that it is not necessary to exaggerate in order to be what he calls inspirational.

Moreover he is no longer an authority in theology. Formerly he could consign all who differed from him to the tender mercies of God — now he has to apologize for his own theological position.

Men no longer treat his words as the final word even in the realm in which he is supposed to be expert. He is not quite sure of himself. If his theology is *new* he fears lest it be regarded as *too* new. He is conscious of grave limitations in his mental processes if his theology be *old*. So with this uncertain accent, he cannot convince men that what he says today will be

the thing he will certainly stand by tomorrow. But he has sure ground, with all classes and conditions of men, if he recognizes himself as the executive officer of an organization whose business it is to make all the world know at first hand Jesus and his good tidings. As the executive officer of such an organization he is in duty bound to keep everlastingly working the organization to accomplish that purpose. In that way will he justify himself before the public and become economically productive. The serious charge against the church organization today is that it is carel  ss of men and women except as they are able to help it. It is charged with catering — that's the word — catering to the people who can help pay its expenses and assist it in acquiring architectural and musical and elocutionary advantages. And the only answer to that charge is the free and large and enthusiastic service it renders to all classes and conditions of men. In that respect its pastor must be the executive officer. If he fails there, the church fails. He is the captain upon the bridge; He is the conductor in charge of the train. If the church runs aground on the shallows of selfishness, he ought to be court-marshalled. If following the other figure the church disobeys orders and runs into an open switch, he ought to be barred from the road.

For whatever is true or uncertain there is absolute agreement on the part of everybody that the only justification of a church, and that includes its chief officer, is to *do good*—to help men live the life of God's children on the earth. The church is not here to criticize the devil nor explain how men came to be sick and poor and sinful. It is here to abolish the devil, and relieve sickness and extinguish poverty, and banish sin; and the machinery is now in the church to accomplish all of these results. And the man entrusted to bring the church to secure those results is the chief officer commonly called the pastor. If he does not do it he should be retired and a man put in charge who can and will do it.

It is idle talk to lay all of this responsibility upon the laymen. The pastor is appointed to

lead, and if he refuses to lead he is not fit for his place. And the most effective way in which the church can do good is in sustaining these missionary projects. Nothing else compares with it in significance and actual returns. A psychotherapeutic pastor may save a drunkard and help a hysterical society woman to be good to her husband, but here in the American Board are four thousand psychotherapeutic people healing folks in all the lands, of every conceivable disease, physical, mental and moral. A pastor who gives himself to electing Hughes or Chandler or Chapin, may influence a few votes for his ticket; but here are statesmen under the pay of the American Board flinging to the breeze the banners of freedom and righteousness over empires like that of the Unspeakable Turk and the late unmentionable Dowager.

A pastor by much burning of gas and electricity may discover for himself and set forth before the people the distinction between the writer JE and the Redactor of the book of Leviticus; but here in this work of the American Board he can tell the story of the evangel in forty tongues to people who never have heard it beyond the seas. Then why should he hesitate to go with enthusiasm and with confidence into the presence of his leading men — and justify his economic productiveness to them by setting before them this reasonable apportionment of benevolent funds to do a work at home and abroad in the most significant enterprises known in the annals of men?

Why should not the pastor be a statesman — a real leader of men, a doer of things that need to be done, not a mere dreamer of theological conundrums? Why should his mind be full of speculations when the actual bare necessities of the mission fields come staring upon him with figures that fairly flame with demand? Why should he be content to have his brother who stood by him in the seminary, struggle along with these awful problems, gaunt and stark, that face him in the hungry multitudes of Peking and Bombay — while he attends to his comfortable parish in America?

If Congregationalism fails to adjust itself to the needs of the times, — if it takes no advantage of modern methods of co-operation and businesslike sense, if it proves democracy in the church as an iridescent dream of the fathers, — unattainable by men with blood and brain, — the fault will lie at the door of the pastor. The possibility rests upon him.

OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES

BY REV. WM. McLANE, D. D., SECRETARY OF
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Creator has permitted thorns and thistles to grow in fields and has made impossible the cultivation of a crop of grain without overcoming difficulties. The Creator permits selfishness and personal ambition in human hearts and makes impossible the cultivation of charity, sympathy and service without overcoming difficulties. Children develop parents quite as much as parents train children, and the exercise of charity develops character quite as much in him who gives as it confers blessing on the part of him who receives. Christ commands them who receive, freely to give. The purpose of this command is quite as much the development of Christian character as the dissemination of the gospel. The Apportionment Plan which is a method of publishing the gospel is likewise a means of promoting brotherly kindness by mutual bearing of burdens.

There are difficulties in accepting and applying the Apportionment Plan. These difficulties are more apparent than real. There are three difficulties which this paper attempts to dissolve. These are the assertions that the Plan is un-Congregational, mechanical and asks too much.

The first of these reminds one of the Congregational deacon who objected to the reading of the Revised Version of the Scriptures (so his pastor told me) because it was new and who said

what was good enough for the apostle Paul was good enough for him. There are in every communion, persons who think that what has been ought to be. Doubtless there are some Congregationalists who think that Saint Paul's method of raising money for charity in Corinth by a voluntary contribution without any effort to suggest an amount is the only proper way of raising money for missionary purposes. Some Congregational folk, also, have been trained to look upon the missionary societies as enterprises to which they may or may not contribute as they elect. Recently a pastor told me of hearing an address by a representative of a missionary society who closed with this appeal: "Now brethren, we want you to help us in our work." This pastor remarked that he should have said: "Now brethren, we want you to help in carrying on your work." The societies — however they may have been constituted in the beginning—are the agents of the Congregational churches in the fulfillment of the Master's command to give the gospel to the whole world.

Congregational people believe in individual liberty; but just so soon as three Congregational men unite to form a Congregational church they assume mutual responsibility for its support. A and B would not be satisfied to have C say that the former two may support this church and he will assert his liberty by giving his money to other equally worthy objects. They will not question his right to give to other objects, but they will affirm his obligation to bear his share—in proportion to his financial ability—in supporting the church to which he belongs. A Congregational church rightly claims liberty to determine and manage its own affairs without dictation from other churches. But just so soon as the First, the Second and the Third Congregational churches of a community unite in conducting some mutual enterprise they assume mutual obligation for the support of that enterprise. No two of these churches would be willing that the third should claim to be free to give or not to give to the support of the common work.

If the Congregational churches of the United States propose together to obey the command of

Christ in the effect to evangelize the world, then they assume mutual obligation to support the agencies by which this evangelization is accomplished. The Apportionment Plan, prepared by a committee duly appointed by the advice of the body in which all the churches of the country are represented and presenting to the churches the amount needed by every society and suggesting what the churches of a State and what, at last, every individual church may be asked to contribute, is as Congregational as any plan could be. There is no claim that it is infallible in the sum suggested to any church as its proportion but only that in general it suggests a fair amount. It is as Congregational and as just in relation to the societies and to every church as is the method of any individual church whose society prepares a budget setting forth the sums needed for care of the buildings, music, salaries, etc., and then by a system of pew rents or weekly pledges, attempts to induce every member to give his fair share of the total amount in proportion to his ability. The two plans are precisely similar in spirit and in method.

Again, it may be claimed that the Plan is mechanical rather than inspirational. Hitherto the societies have worked apart, each one presenting, as best it could, its own needs and depending on the impression made and on the enthusiasm aroused to secure enough by sundry collections to conduct its work. The Apportionment Plan, in contrast with the above method, seems calculating, definite, businesslike, lacking in faith on the part of the societies and in dependence on love on the part of the churches. The writer once knew a school where certain students of theology claimed to live by faith and then went into the city and prayed in front of stores and other places telling the Lord their wants so that the ears of men could hear and in the hope that the hands of men would help. These students for the ministry did not seem to the present writer to be men of faith more than the students of other schools who accepted aid through the regular channels of educational societies or who simply went to work to earn the means needed for their support. In like

manner the present plan proposed to raise money for missionary purposes by definitely stating the sums pledged by the societies at the beginning of any year for the support of hundreds of schools and thousands of missionaries under their care and by suggesting to the States and to the churches the amounts which they are requested to contribute in the faith that the churches will respond seems quite as much an act of faith and shows as much confidence in Christian love as any less definite plan. The plan depends on intelligence and enthusiasm and fullness of Christian love. Where the writer has spoken, East and West, business men who have heard him have heartily approved the plan.

Again, it is said, the sums asked are too high and beyond the ability of the churches. Comparisons are odious and it seems especially odious to compare the cost of vices with the contributions of virtue; but such contrasts are suggestive. Not long since the writer had occasion to speak on temperance. In preparing to speak he visited several saloons and interviewed bar-tenders and the patrons of the bar. He found that from twenty to twenty-five cents a day was considered a moderate sum for a man to spend on drink. If any one cares to make the division, he will find that an average of five cents a day for each resident member of our Congregational churches will pay all the home expenses reported in the Year Book and will provide more than two million dollars for our missionary societies. Is this sum beyond our financial ability? It may be said that some of our members are children and some are poor people. This is true; but it is also true that we have many attendants who are not communicants but who are contributors. Any one who will stand at the entrance of a cheap theatre in any of our cities in which people pay from ten to thirty cents for a seat and who will note the large number of people whom he will class among the poor who pay these prices and who pay them frequently will feel sure that where there is an equal devotion to the church the sums indicated above can be paid even by the poor of our churches. Is the amount asked too

high? The amount asked for all the societies varies from some seventy-five cents per member a year in some of the southern States where the churches are small to some four dollars and forty cents per resident member a year in our strongest States. The average amount asked in the State where the writer lives is some four dollars a year. Tomorrow a college football game is to be played in the city in which the writer lives. There are thirty thousand seats in the bleachers which have been sold at two dollars per seat. Many friends of the writer, some of whom probably feel that they can give but little to missions will be present at the game. When most of our average people can pay and do pay such sums for a half day's enjoyment (and who will question their right to the enjoyment?) they can certainly contribute four dollars a year for the support of missions. And this is just an average. While some may be able to give but little many will give hundreds and many thousands of dollars to our societies.

The Apportionment Plan in its method is Congregational, in its spirit is as inspirational as any other plan and in its aim is reasonable and within the reach of our churches.

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE STATE COMMITTEE

BY REV. WILLIAM S. BEARD, OF WILLIMANTIC,
CONN.

We little suspect the potency of the apportionment movement. It contains within itself not only the power to solve our problems in benevolence but also to weld the 6,000 Congregational churches into a Church and to hasten the day of the arrival of the social consciousness, when not independency but fellowship shall be most dearly cherished. But this article is not to be

a brief for apportionment. The apportionment plan needs no apologetic. Two things are to be attempted; first, to give encouragement to missionary committees by disclosing the mind of the church with reference to the worth of this method; second, to indicate some of the principles which are involved in its successful application.

I. The churches are ready for the apportionment movement. A considerable number of churches have been hesitating on the brink of giving because they were bewildered by the vastness of the opportunity and could not see their duty in the light of the need. Apportionment has solved the problem. One little church which the New Hampshire State Committee had almost advised to disband because of its feebleness, being apportioned \$11 the first year, gladly gave this amount and \$15 the second year. Another church which had done little or nothing, being apportioned \$42, raised one-quarter of its quota at the first collection and complained the next year because it was not asked to do more. A third church which during the last year of the old method raised \$12 with difficulty, being given a quadruple apportionment, gladly raised it all. Still another church to raise its quota gave more than for any year of the previous seventeen. Another increased its benevolence thirty-six per cent, another eighty per cent and still another one hundred per cent. There is a large acreage of rich, uncultivated ground in our churches which the Apportionment Plan will till. If it is remarked that \$15 and \$40 are small sums, yet let it be remembered that sixty churches giving \$15 means another missionary at work, and who shall say that that is without significance? It thrills a man's soul with joy to hear the churches say of apportionment, "It is what we have been waiting for."

II. But, how shall the plan best be put in operation? It is less difficult than many a man anticipates. In connection with the New England Congress representatives of some of the Seven Societies and of all the State Missionary Committees in New England, for three hours discussed the question in the light of their ex-

perience and these in part are their conclusions.

First. Being given the Apportionment for the State by the Advisory Committee, the Missionary Committee of the State should then apportion this amount among the various Conferences or Associations of the State.

Second. The basis of this Conference apportionment should be the home expenses of the churches of the Conference rather than their benevolent gifts. If you can ascertain what a man can spend on himself, you can estimate his ability to do for his brethren. Accepting this principle as valid, this estimate should be made on a basis of not less than a five year period. Thus, discover what proportion of the entire home expenses of the State a given Conference has sustained on an average of a five year period. That per cent of the entire quota apportioned the State by the Advisory Committee will be the lump expected from that Conference for all of the seven societies.

Third. The State Committee should be comprised of one representative from each Conference of the State and elected by the State Conference. The crux of the whole situation is the point of contact between the State and Conference. With a representative from each Conference on the State Committee an important difficulty is solved; for every Conference will know the methods and spirit of the State Committee.

Fourth. Each Conference should appoint a local committee on benevolence, one of whose members and whose chairman should be the Conference member of the State Committee.

Fifth. The Conference Committee, being more accurately informed as to the local conditions in the various churches, should allot the quota assigned that Conference by the State Committee to the various churches of the Conference. This apportionment should be made not only by considering the home expenses of the individual church but also the past gifts of the church, its membership and any other features which may assist in determining its capacity for giving. While the apportionment should be made in a lump sum, this sum should also be divided on a

proportionate basis among the societies. Care should be exercised not to discourage any church by assigning an amount beyond its probable reach, even though the entire quota for that Conference be not secured.

Sixth. The churches of the Conference should then be divided among the members of the Conference Committee, each member being assigned an equal number, to the end that the various members of the Conference Committees, with such other assistants as they may be able to secure, constitute themselves leaders of these various groups, disseminating intelligence and urging the fulfillment of the definite task as the minimum of responsibility.

Finally. It is then for the local pastor to call together the missionary committee, the representatives of the various missionary societies, and dividing the quota for his church into shares, to pledge each society, church, Sunday School, and Christian Endeavor to the number of shares the individual organization thinks it may raise.

From whatever standpoint it may be viewed, the Apportionment Plan has larger possibilities than anything else which has loomed upon the Congregational horizon in many years. If it shall serve to give us a needed sense of fellowship it will do much. But if in addition it shall aid Congregationalism by systematic methods to achieve the whole work which God commits to it, any man who has been in any way connected with the initiation of the plan will find his full reward in sharing the joy of his Lord.

TESTIMONIALS FROM PROMINENT PASTORS AND LAYMEN

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D. D., OF PORTLAND,
MAINE

I am heartily in favor of the Apportionment Plan for the orderly raising of the needed funds to carry on properly our great missionary work.

The plan in no way interferes with the desires of any church. It prescribes no method by which the money shall be raised. It simply sets before each church a concrete objective. It enables each church to answer the question: What is my share of the two million dollars needed for the missionary work of the Congregational churches of America? It enables each church contributing that amount to say, "If every church did the same, the work would be done." And in addition to this great gain, it causes all our missionary societies to work together toward a common goal. In the right working of the Apportionment Plan lies the solution of the money problem of the benevolences of our churches.

DR. LUCIEN C. WARNER, OF NEW YORK

The Apportionment Plan is the substitution of system and organization in our benevolence for chance and accident. No man would think of conducting a two million dollar business without thorough organization which would secure economy of administration and efficiency in results. A church which adopts a plan of systematic benevolence finds that it increases its benevolent gifts and its general prosperity. In like manner a systematic treatment of the benevolences of our entire denomination is sure to increase our gifts and to bring increased blessings to the churches which participated in the plan.

ALFRED COIT, ESQ., OF NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

In my opinion the Apportionment Movement is the most important one in our church today, combining, as it does, the ideas of fellowship in planning and working together, of systematic and organized giving, of mutual helpfulness — the stronger churches doing even more than their share to relieve the weaker ones, and each society realizing more than ever before the just claims of the rest to a fair share of the benevolent contributions of the church and in general, of consecrated common sense, which has been

woefully lacking in too much of the management and conduct of our church affairs. Connecticut has a State Missionary Committee of seventeen, a member from each Conference, which is doing great work for the Apportionment Plan.

REV. ALEXANDER LEWIS, PH. D., OF KANSAS
CITY, MISSOURI

The advantages of the Apportionment Plan are all summed up in the statement that it is the best business methods applied to church benevolences, in that it gives a definite object for each church and localizes responsibility. The best testimony for the plan however, is the following facts. Of Missouri's seventy-seven churches, nineteen equalled or exceeded their total apportionment for last year.

Twenty-seven churches equalled or exceeded the C. H. M. S. Apportionment.

Twenty-three churches equalled or exceeded the A. B. C. F. M. Apportionment.

Eighteen churches equalled or exceeded the C. C. B. S. Apportionment.

Eight churches equalled or exceeded the A. M. A. Apportionment.

Thirteen churches equalled or exceeded the C. E. S. Apportionment.

Twenty-seven churches equalled or exceeded the S. S. & P. S. Apportionment.

A comparison of our benevolences for the past two years with the preceding two shows these interesting facts.

1. A juster division of our gifts.
2. A falling off in the column of "other" benevolences, and an increase for the seven societies.
3. Many of the small churches giving far beyond any previous record.

REV. WM. W. LEETE, OF NEW HAVEN, CON-
NECTICUT

I expressed long ago (See *Congregationalist*, Jan. 20, 1898, page 86) my faith in the Apportionment Plan. I believe in it the more strongly now that so many others believe in it too. What

we need in every State and every local conference, is the immediate application of the plan. It will require several years for clear appreciation and considerate adjustments, but let us not stand too long upon the order of our going. The plan will not only secure more money, it will be one of the strongest evangelists we can send among the churches. It will lead to searchings of heart and deeper consecration, and the too easy cry of "Lord, Lord," will be more and more changed to a faith approved by its work.

REV. C. M. GATES, OF SACO, MAINE

The most important advantages of the Apportionment Plan seem to me to be four-fold:—

1. It emphasizes the idea that the missionary work of the church is not something extraneous to it, but an essential part of the church's activity, to be planned for and supported in as businesslike a manner as are the ordinary church services.

2. It secures to each branch of the work undertaken by our Congregational churches, its fair share of gifts.

3. It emphasizes the fact—too often forgotten—that the missionary work of the church is a unit, not a combination of mutually antagonistic enterprises.

4. It gives an end for which to strive and so stimulates to increased effort.

REV. FRANK S. FITCH, BUFFALO, NEW YORK

I believe in the Apportionment Plan. We have adopted it in our New York State Association and in our own church. At first it will be ideal and educational. In the end it will be convenient and trustworthy and will lessen the cares of pastors, deacons and secretaries. It is businesslike and in the line of faithful stewardship. To make it satisfactory, the Women's Boards, Sunday Schools and Young People's associations should have a proportionate part so that a spirit of "Esprit de corps" may be found in each organization and in the church as a whole, "Many members and the same spirit."

American Board Publications

Missionary Herald

Published monthly. Contains latest information from all our missions. 75 cents per year. In clubs of ten or more, 50 cents each. This organ of the Board was never more prized by its readers than now, and it is essential for those who would keep informed in regard to the work of our Foreign Missions and the great religious movements in non-Christian lands.

Envelope Series

A quarterly issued by the Home Department of the Board, in which we present some of our most important articles. Subscription, 10 cents a year.

News Bulletin

Issued by the Home Department from time to time, and invaluable as a brief, newsy synopsis of the leading current events in the missionary world. Furnished free upon payment of postage. A new number just out containing news items of great interest.

The Medical Missionary

A new pamphlet by Sec. James L. Barton. Beautifully printed and profusely illustrated. The contents are extraordinarily interesting—a revelation to those who have not read of our hospital work. Price, 15c.

The Naturalization of Christianity in the Far East

This pamphlet by Prof. Edward C. Moore, D. D., of Harvard University, is likely to become a classic on the subject which it treats. It is especially adapted to thoughtful students of missionary theory and practice.

Men and Missions

An intensely interesting, brief setting forth of the obligations of Christian men in view of the unparalleled missionary opportunity, by Talcott Williams, Editor of the Philadelphia Press, one of the most eloquent writers in America.

Literature and leaflets of the American Board may be had by addressing:

JOHN G. HOSMER, Congregational House, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Or at the offices of the District Secretaries:

REV. C. C. CREEGAN, D. D., 4th Avenue and 22d Street, New York City.

REV. A. N. HITCHCOCK, Ph. D., 153 La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REV. H. MELVILLE TENNEY, Barker Block, Berkeley, Cal.